

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

CORDIS CORPORATION,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	C.A. No. 97-550-SLR
v.	)	(Consolidated)
	)	
MEDTRONIC AVE, INC.; BOSTON	)	
SCIENTIFIC CORPORATION; and	)	
SCIMED LIFE SYSTEMS, INC.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
<hr/>		
MEDTRONIC AVE, INC.,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	C.A. No. 97-700-SLR
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
CORDIS CORPORATION; JOHNSON &	)	
JOHNSON; and EXPANDABLE GRAFTS	)	
PARTNERSHIP,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**CORDIS' REVISED PROPOSED FORM OF SPECIAL VERDICT  
AND INTERROGATORIES TO THE JURY (CORDIS v. MEDTRONIC AVE)**

Pursuant to Local Rule 51.1, Cordis Corporation hereby submits its revised proposed form of special verdict and interrogatories to the jury.

ASHBY & GEDDES

/s/ John G. Day

Steven J. Balick (I.D. #2114)

John G. Day (I.D. #2403)

222 Delaware Avenue, 17<sup>th</sup> Floor

P.O. Box 1150

Wilmington, DE 19801

(302) 654-1888

*Attorneys for Cordis Corporation and  
related Johnson & Johnson parties*

*Of Counsel:*

Gregory L. Diskant  
William F. Cavanaugh, Jr.  
Kim J. Landsman  
Eugene M. Gelernter  
Michael J. Timmons  
PATTERSON, BELKNAP, WEBB, & TYLER LLP  
1133 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10036  
212-336-2000

Theodore B. Van Itallie, Jr.  
Eric I. Harris  
JOHNSON & JOHNSON  
One Johnson & Johnson Plaza  
New Brunswick, NJ 08933  
732-524-0400

Dated: March 8, 2005  
154366.1

**CORDIS' PROPOSED SPECIAL VERDICT FORM**

We, the jury, unanimously find as follows:

**Infringement**

All Claims

1. Has Cordis shown by a preponderance of the evidence that the walls of the tubular members in the Microstent II are of substantially uniform thickness?

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

2. Has Cordis shown by a preponderance of the evidence that the walls of the tubular members in the GFX and GFXII stents are of substantially uniform thickness?

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

**Validity**

1. Has Medtronic AVE shown by clear and convincing evidence that claim 23 of the '762 patent would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art as of the invention date of the '762 patent?

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

2. Has Medtronic AVE shown by clear and convincing evidence that claim 51 of the '762 patent would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art as of the invention date of the '762 patent?

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

3. Has Medtronic AVE shown by clear and convincing evidence that claim 54 of the '762 patent would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art as of the invention date of the '762 patent?

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

4. Has Medtronic AVE shown by clear and convincing evidence that claim 1 of the '984 patent would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art as of the invention date of the '984 patent?

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

5. Has Medtronic AVE shown by clear and convincing evidence that claim 3 of the '984 patent would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art as of the invention date of the '984 patent?

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on the 8<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2005, the attached **CORDIS'**

**REVISED PROPOSED FORM OF SPECIAL VERDICT AND INTERROGATORIES TO  
THE JURY (CORDIS v. MEDTRONIC AVE)** was served upon the following counsel of  
record in the manner indicated:

Karen Jacobs Loudon, Esquire  
Morris Nichols Arsht & Tunnell  
1201 N. Market Street  
Wilmington, DE 19801

VIA ECF FILE AND SERVE

Raphael V. Lupo, Esquire  
McDermott, Will & Emery  
c/o Karen Jacobs Loudon, Esquire  
Morris Nichols Arsht & Tunnell  
1201 N. Market Street  
Wilmington, DE 19801

VIA FACSIMILE

Josy W. Ingersoll, Esquire  
Young Conaway Stargatt & Taylor  
Rodney Square North  
Wilmington, DE 19801

VIA ECF FILE AND SERVE

George E. Badenoch, Esquire  
Kenyon & Kenyon  
One Broadway  
New York, NY 10004

VIA FACSIMILE

/s/ John G. Day

John G. Day